

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

DEREK STENSON,

Plaintiff,

V.

KING COUNTY, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C23-1316 MJP

ORDER DENYING JOINT
MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
DEADLINES

This matter comes before the Court on the Parties' Joint Stipulated Motion for Relief Deadlines and to Continue Trial Date. (Dkt. No. 27.) Having reviewed the Motion and all the materials, the Court DENIES the Motion without prejudice.

The Parties ask the Court to extend the trial date and interim deadlines by 90 days because the Parties “do not anticipate that all written discovery and depositions can reasonably be completed before the current discovery cut-off of August 12, 2024.” (Mot. at 1.) The Parties also note that Defendant Leenstra was deposed on July 2, 2024 and they are still waiting for a transcript from the deposition that their experts need to review before submitting a “rebuttal

1 report.” (Mot. at 2.) The deadline for expert disclosures was July 10, 2024, and any rebuttal
 2 reports are due 30 days from that deadline. (Order on Stip. Mot. for Relief (Dkt. No. 24)); Fed.
 3 R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2)(D)(ii). The Parties also state that “Defendants have sought depositions of
 4 several witnesses,” that plaintiffs have “provided dates for two,” and that “Defendants are
 5 requesting August dates.” (Mot. at 3.)

6 The Court does not find good cause on this record to extend the trial date or any interim
 7 deadlines. First, the Parties have not explained why their experts cannot complete their rebuttal
 8 reports in the time that remains before they are due on August 9, 2024. The Parties claim their
 9 expert needs to review Leenstra’s deposition transcript and that they do not yet have the
 10 transcript. But Leenstra’s deposition was taken on July 2, 2024, and the Parties do not explain
 11 why they did not request an expedited transcript if they needed it for their experts so quickly.
 12 There appears ample time for rebuttal reports. Second, the Parties fail to explain why they cannot
 13 complete the remaining depositions before the August 12, 2024 discovery deadline. The Parties
 14 identify the need to take depositions of “several witnesses,” but they do not state how many and
 15 when they first requested these depositions. Nor do the Parties identify any reason why the
 16 depositions cannot be scheduled before the end of discovery. Lastly, the Parties do not identify
 17 what, if any, written discovery remains to be answered, when it was served, and why it cannot be
 18 completed before the end of discovery. On this record, the Court finds an absence of good cause
 19 and DENIES the Motion.

20 The Court’s denial is without prejudice to a renewed motion to addresses the Court’s
 21 concerns and which considers a narrowed request for extension of interim deadlines alone.

22 \\

23 \\

1 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

2 Dated July 11, 2024.

3 

4 Marsha J. Pechman
5 United States Senior District Judge

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24